



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/384,541	08/27/1999	DAVID D. TAIEB	52817.00110	7979

29315 7590 06/17/2004

MINTZ LEVIN COHN FERRIS GLOVSKY AND POPEO PC  
12010 SUNSET HILLS ROAD  
SUITE 900  
RESTON, VA 20190

EXAMINER

RAHIMI, IRAJ A

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2622

DATE MAILED: 06/17/2004

27

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

## Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/384,541

Applicant(s)

TAIEB, DAVID D.

Examiner

(Iraj) Alan Rahimi

Art Unit

2622

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 02 April 2004.  
2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.  
3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are pending in the application.  
4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.  
5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.  
6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are rejected.  
7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.  
8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

- 9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.  
10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 29 August 2003 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).  
11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).  
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:  
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.  
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.  
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).  
\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

### Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)  
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)  
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_.  
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_.  
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)  
6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_.

## **DETAILED ACTION**

### ***Specification***

1. The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities: Specification on page 1 refers to copending US patent applications but does not provide the reference numbers. Appropriate correction is required.

### ***Response to Amendment***

2. In papers filed on February 2, 2004, applicant amended claims 1, 2, 6, 11, 16 to correct minor grammatical errors.

### ***Response to Arguments***

3. Applicant's arguments filed on February 2, 2004 have been fully considered and are persuasive. Applicant argues that Moore does not disclose parsing characters of the message and comparing each character against a table bank. Examiner is citing new reference, Davis et al. (US patent 5,495,577) and Froessl (US patent 6,023,528) for these teachings. This action is No-Final.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains.

Art Unit: 2622

Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claims 1-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Davis et al. (US patent 5,495,577) in view of Froessler (US patent 6,023,528).

Regarding claim 1, Davis discloses a method of selecting a font to output a message represented by at least one unknown language, comprising the steps of:

parsing characters of the message and comparing each character of the message against entries in a character table bank, wherein the entries in the character table bank comprise a plurality of character sets;

identifying the character sets of the character table bank that support the characters of the message;

traversing the linked list of structures to compare the at least one category of information associated with available system fonts against the identified character sets;

selecting at least one of the available system fonts to output the message based on the comparison results between the at least one category of information associated with available system fonts and the identified character sets (column 5, lines 13-60).

However, Davis does not disclose creating a linked list of structures including at least one category of information associated with available system fonts. Froessler discloses in column 14, lines 27-67 this limitation. Davis and Froessler are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor that is font processing. Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person skilled in the art, at the time of invention to

Art Unit: 2622

combine the list creation of the of Froessler with Davis in order to accumulate a complete listing of the observed fonts.

Regarding claim 2, Froessler discloses a method of claim 1, wherein the step of creating the linked list of structures including at least one category of information associated with the available system fonts comprises creating font tag information (column 14, lines 27-67).

Regarding claim 3, Davis does not disclose a method of claim 1, wherein the message is output to a printer. However, it would have been obvious to a person skilled in the art, at the time of invention to output the message to printer after processing for providing a hard copy.

Regarding claim 4, Davis discloses a method of claim 2, wherein the characters of the message are encoded in Unicode (column 5, lines 5-9).

Regarding claim 5, Davis teaches a method of claim 1, wherein the step of identifying the character sets of the character table bank that support the characters of the message further comprises associating at least a code page to the characters of the message (Figure 4).

Regarding claims 6 and 16 arguments analogous to those presented for claim 1, are applicable.

Art Unit: 2622

Regarding claims 9, 14 and 19 arguments analogous to those presented for claim 4, are applicable.

Regarding claim 11, arguments analogous to those presented for claims 1 and 3, are applicable.

Regarding claim 7, 12 and 17 arguments analogous to those presented for claim 2, are applicable.

Regarding claims 10, 15 and 20, arguments analogous to those presented for claim 5, are applicable.

#### ***Contact Information***

6. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to (Iraj) Alan Rahimi whose telephone number is 703-306-3473. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon.-Fri. 7:30-4:00.


If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Edward L Coles can be reached on 703-305-4712. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are 703-872-9314 for regular communications and 703-872-9314 for After Final communications.

Art Unit: 2622

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-305-3800.

AR

Alan Rahimi  
June 14, 2004



EDWARD COLES  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600